UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/639,674	08/11/2003	Eric Moore	11973-007001	6822

26181   7590   12/27/2007
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
WEI, ZHENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/639,674	Applicant(s) MOORE ET AL.
	Examiner Zheng Wei	Art Unit 2192

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>15 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

     Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

     NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: *1-29*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
   See·Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The Applicants have submitted: "The cited portions of Highland do not disclose or suggest a dependency graph that includes entity nodes, condition nodes, and rule nodes, as required by claim 1" at page 7, third paragraph. However, as Highland disclosed at Figure 1a-b and related text at col.2, lines 23-46, col.5 line16-col.6 line 3, the Entity node is a simple backward chaining system which organizes it rules as a set of goal trees (see for example, col.2, lines 23-25); the attribute node is a single goal node as disclosed in Fig.1b; the condition node can be the node "x-1" or "Y<10" in Fig.1b and the rule node can be found in Fig.1b as "AND" or "OR" node. Therefore, Highland does disclose all the nodes as cited in Claim 1.

At page 8, fifth paragraph, the applicants contends that Burke does not discloses or suggest determining logical conflicts within a rule set where a logical conflict exists when two or more rules receiving the same input result in contradictory action. However, as Burke disclosed, at col.3 lines 33-35, "If multiple rules are satisfied at the same time, the rule with the highest priority is selected for firing" and col.4, lines 4-6, "If two rules are satisfied at the same time, the instantiation of the rule with the higher valued priority wins". It also indicates that the each of these two or more rules can be applied to same input (satisfied at the same time), but only one rule can be selected to fire (conflict if selects more than one rule). Therefore, Burke does disclose this limitation as cited in Claim 16.

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER